DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 811 TM 850 306

AUTHOR Goldinher, Martin R.
TITLE Evaluation of the 1983-84 ECIA, Chapter II Motivate and Stimulate for Excellence Project.
INSTITUTION Dade County Public Schools, Miami, FL. Office of Educational Accountability.
PUB DATE Oct 84
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academically Gifted; Achievement Gains; Attitude Measures; Critical Thinking; Elementary Education; *Enrichment Activities; Parent Attitudes; Pretests Posttests; Problem Solving; *Program Evaluation; Special Programs; Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Dade County Public Schools FL; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 2

ABSTRACT

The 1983-84 Motivate and Stimulate for Excellence (MASE) Project in 10 Dade County, Florida, elementary schools was funded under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter II. It was designed to provide academically above average students with enrichment activities to enhance their critical thinking and problem solving skills through direct instructional services of full time teachers. This MASE Project evaluation collected data through records examination, observation of project activities, student and parent questionnaires, and program personnel interviews. Evaluation results indicate that most project activities occurred as specified by the project proposal. Most project teachers found the MASE materials, supplies, and facilities adequate. Most project students and parents perceived the MASE program positively. Parents gave only moderately high ratings for the adequacy of information received on the project and their child's progress. Pretest and posttest results from the Developing Cognitives Abilities Test (DCAT) and the Ross Test of Higher Cognitive Processes showed substantial increases in higher level skills across all grade levels. Apppendices contain the primary and intermediate student survey forms, the parent questionnaire, and student selection guidelines. (BS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Turner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DADE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Mr. Paul L. Cejas, Chairman
Mr. Robert Renick, Vice-Chairman
Mrs. Ethel Beckham
Mr. G. Holmes Braddock
Dr. Michael Krop
Ms. Janet McAliley
Mr. William H. Turner

Dr. Leonard Britton
Superintendent of Schools

EVALUATION OF THE 1983-84
ECIA, CHAPTER II
MOTIVATE AND STIMULATE FOR EXCELLENCE PROJECT

Principal Evaluator/Author: Martin R. Goldinher

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
OCTOBER, 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Background	3
Description of the Project	3
Description of the Evaluation	3
Extent to Which Student Participants Met the Criteria Established for Admission into the Project	3
Adequacy of Facilities and Availability of Materials for the Operation of the Project	3
Extent to Which Participating Students Evidenced Gains in Areas of Critical Thinking and Problem Solving	4
Attitudes of Students and Parents Toward the Project	4
Results	5
Extent to Which Project Participants Met the Criteria Established for Admission into the Project	5
Adequacy of Instructional Facilities	5
Availability of Materials, Equipment and Supplies	5
Extent to Which Participating Students Evidenced Gains in the Higher Cognitive Thinking Skills	7
Attitudes of Primary Level (Grades 1-2) Students Toward the the Project	9
General Orientation Toward the Project	9
Reaction to Participation in the Project	9
Perceived Effects of Project Participation	9
Attitudes of Intermediate Level (Grades 3-6) Students Toward the Project	9
General Orientation Toward the Project	14
Reaction to Participation in the Project	14
Perceived Effects of Project Participation	14
Attitudes of Parents Toward the Project	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Understanding/Communication	18
Project Design and Procedures	18
Perceived Effects of Project Participation.	18
MASE project/Regular Program Intergration	18
Conclusions and Recommendations	18
Appendix A - Motivate and Stimulate for Excellence (MASE) Program Student Survey - Primary Form (Grades 1-2).	20
Appendix B - Motivate and Stimulate for Excellence (MASE Program Student Survey - Intermediate Form (Grades 3-6).	22
Appendix C - Motivate and Stimulate for Excellence (MASE) Program Parent Questionnaire.	24
Appendix D - Guidelines for the Selection of Students for Participation in the 1982-83 MASE Program	27

Executive Summary

The 1983-84 Motivate and Stimulate for Excellence (MASE) Project was funded in the amount of $245,802 under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA), Chapter II. The project was designed to provide academically above-average students with enrichment activities to enhance their development of critical thinking and problem solving skills. Students were selected primarily on the basis of scores on the Cooperative Pre-School Inventory or appropriate versions of the Stanford Achievement Test, depending on their grade levels.

Project services were provided at ten elementary schools including nine schools that had MASE programs during the 1982-83 school year and one that did not have previous experience with this type of project (Lorah Park). The MASE project was to provide direct instructional services through full-time teachers in nine project schools and a half-time teacher in one project school.

The evaluation of this project addressed both the extent to which project activities occurred as specified in the program proposal (process) and the extent to which specific project objectives were attained (product). Data collection activities included examination of records, observation of project activities, surveying via questionnaire, and conducting interviews with program personnel. These evaluation activities addressed the following questions:

1. To what extent do project participants meet the criteria established for admission into the project?

2. How adequate are the project facilities and the quantity/quality of materials available for instruction?

3. To what extent do participating students evidence gains in the higher level cognitive thinking skills specified in the program proposal?

4. What are the general attitudes of students and parents toward this project?

The results of this evaluation indicate that most project activities occurred as specified in the program proposal. An exception to this generalization occurred with respect to a smaller-than-specified number of students served at some of the (smaller) project schools. The materials, supplies, and facilities to provide MASE instruction were judged adequate by the majority of project teachers.

Most project students reported positive feelings about the MASE program, the work they did in the MASE class, and the effects of their participation. Parents or participating students provided only moderately high ratings for the adequacy of orientation to the project and the adequacy with which they were informed of their child's progress in the project. Parents were supportive of the project's design and procedures and the vast majority indicated a desire for their children to continue to participate. The majority of parents also felt that the project had positive effects on their children and that integration between the MASE project and the regular education program

was good. In communicating with project teachers throughout the year, no comments regarding gross project inadequacies were noted. These teachers did, however, express a desire for continued opportunities to interact with one another for the purpose of sharing information regarding instructional resources and approaches. Five meetings were provided this year for the teachers to interact and share ideas.

The Developing Cognitive Abilities Test (DCAT) and Ross Test of Higher Cognitive Processes were used to determine the extent to which participating students evidenced gains in higher level cognitive thinking skills (analysis, synthesis and evaluation). Overall test data indicated that substantial increases in higher level cognitive skills were evidenced across all grade levels for participating students.

As a result of these generally favorable findings, the following recommendations are made:

1. Project schools with relatively small student enrollments from which to select participants should be permitted to serve fewer students than project schools with greater numbers of students.

2. An effort should be made to more adequately orient parents to the project, to more clearly explain the admission criteria and to keep parents more adequately informed of their child's progress in the program.

3. Program instructional staff should be provided with continued inservice training related to the operation of the project and instructional activities. A survey of their needs should be made prior to the actual provision of inservice training.

Background

Description of the Project

The 1983-84 Motivate and Stimulate for Excellence (MASE) Project was funded in the amount of $245,802 under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA), Chapter II. The project was designed to provide academically above-average students with enrichment activities to enhance their development of critical thinking and problem solving skills. Students were selected primarily on the basis of scores on the Cooperative Pre-School Inventory or appropriate versions of the Stanford Achievement Test, depending on their grade levels.

Project services were provided at ten elementary schools including nine schools that had MASE programs during the 1982-83 school year and one that did not have previous experience with this type of project (Lorah Park). The MASE project was to provide direct instructional services through a full-time teacher in nine project schools and a half-time teacher in one project school. Each full-time teacher was to provide instructional services to between 55-110 students and the half-time teacher was to serve between 35-55 students. Each student was supposed to receive between 180-300 minutes of MASE instruction per week to be provided in three to five instructional sessions. Various academic disciplines (math, reading, social studies, and science) were to be used as vehicles for instruction in the higher level cognitive skills.

Description of the Evaluation

The evaluation of this project addressed both the extent to which project activities occurred as specified in the program proposal (process) and the extent to which specific project objectives were attained (product). Data collection activities included examination of records, observation of project activities, surveying via questionnaire and conducting interviews with project personnel. The following section provides an overview of the general approaches that were taken in the evaluation.

Extent to which student participants met the criteria established for admission into the project. The Department of Program Evaluation developed a Participant Roster form that was completed by school level personnel at each of the project schools. Information included on the form were students' names, grade levels and scores from the standardized achievement test used to determine program eligibility. Examination of the completed participant rosters allowed a determination of the extent to which participating students were identified on the basis of the eligibility criteria. This examination also permitted a determination of the number of students served at each project school as well as the total number of students served by the project.

Adequacy of facilities and availability of materials for the operation of the project. Interviews with instructional personnel and observations of instructional activities were conducted at selected sites, to obtain information pertaining to facilities and materials.

Extent to which participating students evidenced gains in the areas of critical thinking and problem solving. Pre and posttesting of all student participants was conducted by project personnel at each of the participating schools. The DCAT (Grades 1-3) and Poss (Grades 4-6) Tests were administered to all student participants. By-grade level analyses of the extent of improvement of students in these cognitive skills were performed.

Attitudes of students and parents toward the project. Survey forms, developed by the Department of Program Evaluation, were distributed to all student participants and parents/guardians of all participating students (see Appendices A through C).

The primary level student survey form (grades 1-2) contained ten statements pertaining to the operation and perceived effectiveness of the project. The primary level survey was administered orally by project teachers with the students responding by placing an "X" on the form to indicate their response. The response options included a happy face indicating that "YES" they agreed with the statement and a sad face indicating that "NO" they did not agree with the statement.

The intermediate level survey form (grades 3-6) contained 18 statements pertaining to the operation and perceived effectiveness of the project. The intermediate level survey could be administered orally by the project teachers or read by the students. All student responses to the intermediate level survey were made on machine scorable answer sheets. The students indicated the extent of their agreement or disagreement to each statement by selecting their response from the five response options available and bubbling in their response on the answer sheet.

The Parent Questionnaire included demographic information such as the student's sex, ethnicity and grade in school, and 21 statements pertaining to the operation and perceived effectiveness on the project. For each of these 21 statements, parents indicated the extent of their agreement or disagreement by selecting and recording an appropriate number from a five point scale. A response option was provided for parents to identify those statements about which they were not sufficiently knowledgeable to respond.

The activities described above provided responses to the following questions:

1. To what extent do project participants meet the criteria established for admission into the project?

2. How adequate are the project facilities and the quantity and quality of materials available for instruction?

3. To what extent do participating students evidence gains in the higher level cognitive thinking skills specified in the program proposal?

4. What are the general attitudes of students and parents toward this project?

Results

Extent to Which Project Participants Met the Criteria Established for Admission into the Project

The program proposal specified that at each of the nine sites providing MASE through the services of a full-time teacher, 55-110 student participants would be identified and at the half-time MASE site, 35-55 students would receive MASE services. To determine the number of students being served at each project school, OEA developed a participant roster that was completed by the MASE teacher at each site. Based on the information included in the rosters, it was determined that the specified number of students received MASE services at five of the ten project schools (see Table I). At one MASE site one less student than the required minimum number was included on their roster and at the four other sites from two to thirteen fewer than the minimum number of students were reported as enrolled. Several schools had experienced declining enrollments, compared to the previous year, due to normal student attrition patterns and population shifts. One school recorded an increase in population due to the inclusion of a special "Fine Arts" program which drew students from other schools. These students were not eligible to participate in the MASE project, however. MASE enrollment ranged from 7% to 25% of the project schools' populations (excluding Kindergarten). Many of the participating schools experienced diminished MASE enrollment, compared to 1982-83, due to competing programs such as; Gifted, Fine Arts, Academic Excellence, etc.

The total number of participants reported on the rosters was 642, of which 40 (6%) left the project during the year. Eligibility scores were provided for 504 (79%) of these participants. Of the 504 students for whom eligibility scores were reported, the scores for 207 students (41%) met the test score eligibility criteria provided in the Guidelines for the Selection of Students (see Appendix D); and 297 (59%) did not meet these criteria. It should be remembered that the student selection guidelines also allowed principals the discretion of selecting additional students for MASE project participation with lower test scores if the application of the test score criteria resulted in the identification of too few students.

Adequacy of Instructional Facilities

In order to assess the adequacy of instructional facilities, interviews were conducted with project teachers and on site visitations made at selected project schools. The results of these activities revealed that, in general, adequate project facilities were provided at all sites.

Availability of Materials, Equipment and Supplies

Information was obtained during interviews with selected project teachers to determine the availability of materials, equipment and supplies necessary to support the provision of MASE instruction. Overall, the teachers at the selected school sites indicated that they had an adequate supply of instructional materials, equipment, and supplies. Several teachers did indicate, however, that they needed money to be allocated for the replacement or purchase of new materials, equipment, and supplies. In communicating with project teachers throughout the year it was noted that they expressed a desire

TABLE I

School and Project Enrollment at Relevant Grade Levels

School	Grade Levels*	Student membership in grades specified as of 10-1-83	MASE project enrollment as of 5-30-84
Bel Aire	1-4	432	52
Caribbean	1-6	790	53
Carver	1-2	249	63
Coral Gables	3-6	465	80
Lorah Park	1-6	610	80
Lucíam (1/2)	1-6	285	33
Moton	5-6	272	42
Pine Lake	1-3	531	74
Richmond	4-6	581	71
Sunset	3-6	298	54

*The grade levels specified do not include Kindergarten since these students did not participate in the MASE project.

for opportunities to interact with one another for the purpose of sharing information regarding instructional resources and approaches. Five opportunities were provided for teachers to meet with one another during the 1983-84 school year.

Extent to Which Participating Students Evidenced Gains in the Higher Cognitive Thinking Skills

To determine the extent to which student participants evidenced gains in higher level cognitive thinking skills, the DCAT and Ross tests were administered on a pretest (October, 1983) and posttest (May, 1984) basis. Both the pretest and the posttest administration and scoring were performed by the project teachers. The raw scores for each school were recorded on test rosters and communicated to OEA for transformation and analysis.

The DCAT level 2 was used to assess the impact of MASE on the verbal, quantitative, and spatial abilities of second grade students. Unlike the higher levels of the DCAT, Bloom's cognitive dimensions (knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, and synthesis) were not assessed because it was believed by the test's publisher that a group-administered testing format could not measure these categories with sufficient precision in younger children.

The DCAT level 3, which was used to assess third grade students, was designed to assess the content area dimensions (verbal, quantitative, and spatial) as well as five of the six dimensions of Bloom's cognitive taxonomy. Bloom's "evaluation" dimension was not included since the requirements for items that adequately assess a student's ability to evaluate were found, by the test's publisher, to be incompatible with the DCAT format and time limits.

The Ross test was used to assess MASE impact on fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students and is comprised of 105 items designed to assess higher-level thinking skills of students in terms of all six of Bloom's taxonomic dimensions.

Results of the DCAT testing for grades one through three are presented in Table II in terms of the major dimensions of the test (verbal, quantitative, and spatial) as well as in terms of total scores. Results of the Ross testing (grades four through six) are presented in Tables III through V. For purposes of reporting, the Ross subtests are grouped according to the appropriate higher level cognitive skills of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Median raw scores and percentiles for pretests and posttests are presented by grade level.

Prior to discussing the results of this testing, it should be noted that both fall and spring norms were available and were used in transforming pre-test scores and post-test scores (respectively) into percentile scores. An increase in percentile (from pre to post-test) for a particular subtest can, thus, be interpreted as a greater (than expected) increase in skill; i.e., can be interpreted as a growth in cognitive skill beyond what would be expected had these students not been exposed to MASE.

For grades 1 and 2 (See Table II) the posttest percentiles are considerably above the level of the corresponding pretest percentiles for all three content

TABLE II

DCAT level 2 & 3 Pretest/Posttest Scores

GRADE 1
DCAT Level 2
(n=80)

	Pretest		Posttest	
	Median raw score	Median percentile	Median raw score	Median percentile
Verbal	26	49	32	86
Spatial	16	60	23	90
Quantitative	13	50	19	92
Total	54	44	73	95

GRADE 2
DCAT Level 2
(n=116)

Verbal	30	59	33	96
Spatial	20	60	23	85
Quantitative	17	74	20	89
Total	70	68	75	96

GRADE 3
DCAT Level 3
(n=92)

Verbal	32	81	36	76
Spatial	12	70	18	86
Quantitative	7	65	10	84
Total	49	80	63	83

areas as well as the total score. While the posttest percentiles for grade 3 students (see Table II) were also above the level of the corresponding pretest percentiles in the case of two content areas as well as the total score, the verbal post-test percentile was slightly lower than that of the pretest, although the raw scores did show an increase over the pretest. For the Ross Test (grades 4, 5, and 6), percentile gains in total scores were noted for all grade levels, indicating that increases in higher cognitive abilities were generally realized. However, at grade five, post-test percentiles for one "Analysis" subtest and both "Evaluation" subtests were lower than corresponding pre-test percentiles. For grade six, this pattern was also noted in the case of one "Synthesis" subtest. It is difficult to reasonably account for these decreases in median percentiles except to note that there appeared to be inconsistencies in some of the normative data, making the resultant percentiles subject to question.

Attitudes of Primary Level (Grades 1-2) Students Toward the Project

Survey forms were completed by approximately 97% of the first and second grade students participating in the project. The survey form contained ten statements to assess students' general orientation toward the project, their reaction to participation, and their perception of the effects of project participation. For each statement, students indicated their agreement or disagreement by marking appropriate responses on the survey form.

Responses to this survey are described below and presented in Table VI. For clarity of presentation, items are grouped under three headings describing various project dimensions. Table VI contains the percentages of students responding to the options for each item.

General orientation toward the project. The primary level questionnaire included six items within this cluster. All six statements received a favorable rating, with at least 93% of the students providing a positive response to each item. A high percentage of students indicated that they liked school (93%) and that the students in their MASE class were friendly with each other (93%). Almost all the primary students (99%) reported that they liked their MASE class. Most students indicated that they wished they could spend more time in their MASE class (98%), wanted to participate in the project next year (96%), and felt they were as smart as the other students in their MASE class (93%).

Reaction to participation in the project. On the primary questionnaire two items were included in this cluster. Almost all students felt that the [illegible] they did in their MASE class made them think (99%) and was also interesting (99%).

Perceived effects of project participation. Both items in this cluster received total agreement. All students indicated that they had tried hard in their MASE class and felt that they had learned a lot in MASE as a result of their participation.

Attitudes of Intermediate Level (Grades 3-6) Students Toward the Project

Survey forms were completed by approximately 80% of the third through sixth grade students participating in the project. The survey form contained 18

TABLE III

Ross Pretest/Posttest Scores

GRADE 4
(n=110)

	Pretest		Posttest	
	Median raw score	Median percentile	Median raw score	Median percentile
Analysis				
Analogies	7	76	9	9[illegible]
Missing Premises	2	40	3	4[illegible]
Analysis of Rel. & Irrelevant Info.	5	53	6	65
Synthesis				
Abstract Relations	8	74	11	78
Sequential Synthesis	2	58	4	81
Analysis of Attributes	8	53	11	88
Evaluation				
Deductive Reasoning	11	75	13	81
Questioning Strategies	7	85	8	86
TOTAL	48	69	64	89

TABLE IV

Ross Pretest/Posttest Scores

GRADE 5
(n=124)

	Pretest		Posttest	
	Median raw score	Median percentile	Median raw score	Median percentile
Analysis				
Analogies	8	72	10	84
Missing Premises	3	71	4	62
Analysis of Rel. & Irrelevant Info.	5	41	7	68
Synthesis				
Abstract Relations	10	69	12	72
Analysis of Attributes	10	65	12	81
Evaluation				
Deductive Reasoning	12	74	13	65
Questioning Strategies	8	84	8	76
TOTAL	59	72	70	81

TABLE V

Ross Pretest/Posttest Scores

GRADE 6
(n=120)

	Pretest		Posttest	
	Median raw score	Median percentile	Median raw score	Median percentile
Analysis				
Analogies	9	76	11	85
Missing Premises	4	63	5	67
Analysis of Rel. & Irrelevant Info.	8	81	10	81
Synthesis				
Abstract Relations	12	73	13	68
Sequential Synthesis	4	74	7	90
Analysis of Attributes	9	54	13	89
Evaluation				
Deductive Reasoning	13	65	15	79
Questioning Strategies	8	31	10	81
TOTAL	64	72	78	83

TABLE VI

Student Survey Responses - Primary Form (Grades 1-2)

(n=210)

	percent responding	
General Orientation Toward MASE Project	YES	NO
I like school.	93	7
Most of the students in my MASE class are friendly with each other.	93	7
I like my MASE class.	99	1
I wish I could spend more time in my MASE class.	98	2
I want to be in MASE next year.	96	4
I am as smart as the other students in my MASE class.	93	7
Reaction to Participation in the MASE Project		
The work I do in my MASE class makes me think.	99	1
The things I do in my MASE class are interesting.	99	1
Perceived Effects of MASE Project Participation		
I try hard in my MASE class.	100	0
I learn a lot in my MASE class.	100	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

statements to assess students' general orientation toward the project, their reaction to participation and their perception of the effects of project participation. For each statement, students indicated the extent of their agreement using a five point scale.

Responses to this survey are described below and presented in Table VII. For clarity of presentation, items are grouped under three headings describing various project dimensions. Table VII contains the percentages of students responding with each of the five response options for each item.

General orientation toward the project. On the intermediate student questionnaire, six items were included within this cluster. High percentages (95%) of students indicated that they were proud to have been selected for participation in MASE, were lucky to get to attend MASE (92%), and were happy to come to their MASE class (92%). Moderate percentages of students felt that the students in their MASE class were friendly with each other (70%) and that they were as smart as the other students in their MASE class (77%). The vast majority of respondents (90%) indicated that they would like to participate in the MASE project during the next school year.

Reaction to participation in the project. Six items were grouped within this cluster. A large percentage (83%) of students disagreed with a statement indicating that the work in their MASE class was too difficult. Relatively high percentages of students indicated that what they did in their MASE class was interesting (92%), challenging (82%), and that they liked the way their MASE class was run (86%). To obtain an indication of the quality of MASE facilities, students were presented with a statement regarding the condition of the furniture in their MASE class. The condition of the furniture was reported as good by 74% of the students. Finally, virtually all of the students (90%) felt that their parents were satisfied with the work they did in their MASE class.

Perceived effects of project participation. A total of six items were included in this cluster. High percentages of students felt that their participation in the MASE program helped them to learn about many new things (96%), helped them develop better study habits (81%), increased their motivation to learn (86%), and helped them increase their self confidence (82%). Almost all students (95%) reported that their MASE teachers made them feel like they wanted them to learn. A mixed response (64% agree, 28% disagreed) was provided to a statement indicating that MASE students made up the work they missed in their regular classes.

Attitudes of Parents Toward the Project

Questionnaires were completed by approximately 58% of the parents. The questionnaire contained 21 statements to assess parents' understanding of the project and their perceptions regarding the project's design, effects and integration with the schools' regular education programs. For each statement the parents indicated the extent of their agreement or disagreement via a five point scale.

Responses to the survey are described below and presented in Table VIII. For clarity of presentation, items are grouped under four headings describing various project dimensions. Table VIII contains the percentages of parents responding with each of the five options to each item.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE VII
Student Survey Responses
Intermediate Form (Grades 3-6)
(n=325)

	percent responding				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
General Orientation Toward the MASE Project					
I am proud of being selected for participation in the MASE program.	01	01	03	12	83
I am lucky to get to attend MASE.	02	01	05	26	66
Most days I'm happy to come to my MASE class.	01	04	03	20	72
Most of the students in my MASE class are friendly with each other.	04	05	21	39	31
I am as smart as other students in my MASE class.	01	03	19	22	55
I would like to be in MASE during the next school year.	02	01	11	05	85
Reaction to participation in the MASE Project					
The work I do in my MASE class is too difficult	51	32	12	03	02
In my MASE class we do many things that interest me.	01	02	05	27	65
The work that I do in my MASE class is challenging.	03	03	12	24	58
I like the way my MASE classes are run.	02	02	10	30	56
The furniture in my MASE class is in good condition.	05	05	16	32	42
My parents are satisfied with the work I do in my MASE class.	01	00	09	23	67
Perceived Effects of MASE Project Participation					
My participation in the MASE program has helped me to develop better study habits.	00	00	03	21	75
My participation in the MASE program has helped me to develop better study habits.	03	03	12	29	52
Participation in the MASE program has increased my motivation to learn.	01	03	10	26	60
Participation in the MASE program has helped me to develop my self-confidence.	02	03	12	28	54
My MASE teacher makes me feel like he/she wants me to learn.	01	00	03	19	76
I make up the work that I miss in my regular class while attending MASE.	18	10	09	28	36

Note: Row percent scores may not total 100 percent due to rounding error.

TABLE VIII
Parent Questionnaire Responses
n=351

	percent responding				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Understanding/Communication					
School personnel adequately oriented me to the MASE program.	04	14	07	46	29
The criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the MASE program were clearly explained to me.	04	12	10	45	30
The MASE program teacher keeps me adequately informed of my child's progress.	06	16	08	42	28
The MASE teacher is readily available if I request a conference.	00	01	11	37	51
Project Design and Procedures					
The criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the MASE program seem reasonable.	01	01	11	50	37
The MASE program's instructional facilities are adequate.	00	04	14	55	26
My child is exposed to instructional activities of an appropriate nature give the goals of the program.	02	01	09	50	38
The amount of time per week that my child spends in the MASE program seems to be sufficient.	03	10	12	54	21
My child receives a sufficient amount of individualized attention in the MASE program.	01	01	19	39	41
My child needs specialized instruction such as that offered in the MASE program to maximize his/her potential.	01	04	09	30	57
I am satisfied with the MASE instructional procedures.	01	01	67	43	48
The MASE teacher at my child's school is sufficiently qualified to teach in the MASE program.	01	00	10	36	53
My child is able to "keep up" with lessons in the MASE program.	01	00	05	42	52
I would like to see my child continue in the MASE program.	01	00	02	17	80

Note: Row percent scores may not total 100 percent due to rounding error.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE VIII
Parent Questionnaire Responses
n=351

	percent responding				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Perceived Effects of Project Participation					
My child enjoys being in the MASE program.	01	00	01	16	82
I can see positive changes in my child at home as a result of his/her participation in the MASE program.	01	04	16	35	44
MASE Project/Regular Program Integration					
My child's regular class teachers have a favorable opinion of the MASE Program.	01	00	24	41	33
Cooperation between my child's MASE and regular class teachers seems to be good.	00	01	13	48	38
Regular class teachers expect my child to make up work that was missed while he/she was receiving MASE instruction.	02	08	21	40	28
I feel that my child should make up work that was missed while he/she was receiving MASE instruction.	03	11	10	35	41
My child is able to "keep up" with lessons in the regular class.	01	01	02	38	58

Note: Row percent scores may not total 100 percent due to rounding error.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Understanding/communication. A total of four items were included in this cluster. Of the four clusters included in the parent questionnaire the lowest percentage of agreement was provided for items within this cluster. Within this cluster, moderate percentages of agreement were given to the adequacy of orientation to the MASE project (75%) and the clarity with which the criteria for admission to the project were explained (75%). The lowest parent agreement for all questionnaire items was provided for the adequacy which parents were informed of their child's progress in the MASE project (70%). A relatively high percentage of respondents (88%), however, indicated that the MASE teachers were readily available if a conference was requested.

Project design and procedures. Ten items were included in the questionnaire to enable parents to express their opinions regarding the project's design and procedures. High percentages of agreement (at least 80%) were provided for nine of the ten items in this cluster. The lowest rating (75%) within this cluster was given to the adequacy of the time per week that children attended the project. A substantial percentage of respondents indicated that the criteria used to qualify for the MASE project seemed reasonable (87%), that the instructional facilities were adequate (81%), and instructional activities appropriate, given the goals of the project (88%). The vast majority of parents felt that their children needed specialized instruction in order to maximize their potential (87%), were satisfied with the amount of individualized attention their children received (80%), and indicated their satisfaction with the instructional procedures used in the MASE project (91%). Highly favorable parental responses were provided in relation to the qualifications of the MASE teachers (89%), the ability of their children to "keep up" with lessons in the MASE project (94%), and the desire for their children to continue to participate in MASE (97%).

Perceived effects of project participation. Only two statements were included to assess the perceived effects of program participation. Almost all parents (98%) felt that their children enjoyed participating in the MASE project and many (79%) indicated they saw positive changes in their child as a result of their child's participation in MASE.

MASE project/regular program integration. Five items were combined to form this cluster. None of the responding parents felt that regular classroom teachers had unfavorable opinions of the MASE program. A substantial percentage of respondents felt that cooperation between the MASE teachers and regular teachers was good (86%). A majority of parents (68%) indicated that their child's regular classroom teacher expected their child to make up the work that was missed as a result of their attendance in MASE. A somewhat larger percentage of parents (76%) felt that their children should make up the work that they miss in their regular classes while receiving MASE instruction. Virtually all parents (96%) felt that their children were able to keep up with their lessons in their regular classes. Over half of the respondents (57%) indicated that they had visited their child's MASE project during the school year.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The MASE project was directed at providing academically above-average students with enrichment activities to enhance their development of critical thinking

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and problem-solving skills. The results of this evaluation indicate that most project activities occurred as specified in the program proposal. An exception to this generalization occurred with respect to a smaller than specified number of students served at some of the (smaller) project schools. The materials, supplies, and facilities to provide MASE instruction were judged adequate by the majority of program teachers. In communicating with project teachers throughout the year, no comments regarding gross project inadequacies were noted. These teachers did, however, express a desire for continued opportunities to interact with one another for the purpose of sharing information regarding instructional resources and approaches.

Most project students reported positive feelings about the MASE project, the work they did in the MASE class, and the effects of their participation. Parents of participating students provided moderate ratings for the adequacy of orientation to the project and the adequacy with which they were informed of their child's progress in the project. Parents were supportive of the project's design and procedures and the vast majority indicated a desire for their children to continue to participate. The majority of parents felt that the project had positive effects on their children and that integration between the MASE project and the regular education program was good.

DCAT and Ross pre and posttest results were used to determine the extent to which participating students evidenced gains in higher level cognitive thinking skills. Overall test data indicated that increases in higher level cognitive skills were evidenced by participating students across all grade levels.

As a result of these generally favorable findings, the following recommendations are made:

1. Project schools with relatively small student enrollments from which to select participants should be permitted to serve fewer students than project schools with greater numbers of students.

2. An effort should be made to more adequately orient parents to the project, to more clearly explain the admission criteria and to keep parents more adequately informed of their child's progress in the program.

3. Program instructional staff should be provided with continued inservice training related to the operation of the project and instructional activities. A survey of their needs should be made prior to the actual provision of inservice training.

APPENDIX A

PLEASE MARK AN "X" DIRECTLY ON THE FACE TO SHOW YOUR ANSWER.

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

MOTIVATE AND STIMULATE FOR EXCELLENCE (MASE) PROGRAM
STUDENT SURVEY - PRIMARY FORM (GRADES 1-2)

EXAMPLES:

	YES	NO
A. ICE CREAM TASTES BETTER THAN SALT.	1	2
B. THE MIAMI DOLPHINS IS THE WORST FOOTBALL TEAM.	1	2

LISTEN TO TEACHER'S INSTRUCTIONS

	YES	NO	
1. I LIKE SCHOOL.	1	2	1
2. I LIKE MY MASE CLASS.	1	2	2
3. MOST OF THE STUDENTS IN MY MASE CLASS ARE FRIENDLY WITH EACH OTHER.	1	2	3
4. I TRY HARD IN MY MASE CLASS.	1	2	4
5. I LEARN A LOT IN MY MASE CLASS.	1	2	5
6. I WANT TO BE IN MASE NEXT YEAR.	1	2	6
7. THE THINGS I DO IN MY MASE CLASS ARE INTERESTING.	1	2	7
8. I AM AS SMART AS THE OTHER STUDENTS IN MY MASE CLASS.	1	2	8
9. THE WORK I DO IN MY MASE CLASS MAKES ME THINK.	1	2	9
10. I WISH I COULD SPEND MORE TIME IN MY MASE CLASS.	1	2	10

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: Apr. 30, 1984

APPENDIX B

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

MOTIVATE AND STIMULATE FOR EXCELLENCE (MASE) PROGRAM
STUDENT SURVEY - INTERMEDIATE FORM (GRADES 3-6)

DIRECTIONS:

You can help to make the MASE program better by giving careful thought to each of the questions that follow. Please respond to each of the questions by darkening the appropriate space on your separate answer sheet. Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers to any of these questions. Your honest response to each question will be the best answer. We appreciate your cooperation and assistance in helping us to evaluate the MASE program. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements according to the scale below.

Strongly Disagree (A/F)	Disagree (B/G)	Uncertain (C/H)	Agree (D/J)	Strongly Agree (E/K)

1. Most days I'm happy to come to my MASE class.
2. Most of the students in my MASE class are friendly with each other.
3. The work I do in my MASE class is too difficult.
4. I am proud of being selected for participation in the MASE program.
5. I am lucky to get to attend MASE.
6. My MASE teacher makes me feel like he/she wants me to learn.
7. The furniture in my MASE classroom is in good condition.
8. I like the way my MASE classes are run.
9. In my MASE class we do many things that interest me.
10. I make up the work that I miss in my regular classes while attending MASE.
11. My participation in the MASE program has helped me to learn about many new things.
12. My parents are satisfied with the work I do in my MASE class.
13. I am as smart as the other students in my MASE class.
14. My participation in the MASE program has helped me to develop better study habits.
15. The work that I do in my MASE class is challenging.
16. Participation in the MASE program has increased my motivation to learn.
17. Participation in the MASE program has helped me to develop my self-confidence.
18. I would like to be in MASE during the next school year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: Apr. 30, 1984

APPENDIX C

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

MOTIVATE AND STIMULATE FOR EXCELLENCE (MASE) PROGRAM
PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

School Name: _____ ☐☐☐☐ 1 - 4

Child's Sex: (check one) Male _____ (1) Female _____ (2) 5

What is the ethnic origin of your child? (check one)

White, Non-Hispanic __(1) Black, Non-Hispanic __(2) Hispanic __(3)

American Indian/Alaskan Native __(4) Asian/ Pacific Islander __(5) 6

Child's Grade: _____ 7

Did you visit your child's MASE program during this school year?

Yes _____ (1) No _____ (2) 8

For each of the following statements please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement by selecting the appropriate number from the scale below, and writing it on the line to the right of each item. Please note: If you feel that you do not have enough information to respond to a statement, place a zero on the line to the right of that item.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Enough Information
1	2	3	4	5	0

School personnel adequately oriented me to the MASE program. _____ 9

The MASE program's instructional facilities are adequate. _____ 10

The criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the MASE program were clearly explained to me. _____ 11

The criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the MASE program seem reasonable. _____ 12

My child is exposed to instructional activities of an appropriate nature given the goals of the program. _____ 13

The amount of time per week that my child spends in the MASE program seems to be sufficient. _____ 14

Auth: MIB; Exp. Date: Apr. 30, 1984

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Enough Information
1	2	3	4	5	0

My child's regular class teachers have a favorable opinion of the MASE program.	____	15
I can see positive changes in my child at home as a result of his/her participation in the MASE program.	____	16
The MASE teacher is readily available if I request a conference.	____	17
My child is able to "keep up" with lessons in the regular class.	____	18
The MASE program teacher keeps me adequately informed of my child's progress.	____	19
The MASE teacher at my child's school is sufficiently qualified to teach in the MASE program.	____	20
My child is able to "keep up" with lessons in the MASE program.	____	21
My child needs specialized instruction such as that offered in the MASE program to maximize his/her potential.	____	22
My child enjoys being in the MASE program.	____	23
My child receives a sufficient amount of individualized attention in the MASE program.	____	24
Regular class teachers expect my child to make up work that was missed while he/she was receiving MASE instruction.	____	25
I feel that my child should make up work that was missed while he/she was receiving MASE instruction.	____	26
I am satisfied with the MASE instructional procedures.	____	27
Cooperation between my child's MASE and regular class teachers seems to be good.	____	28
I would like to see my child continue in the MASE program.	____	29

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: Apr. 30, 1984

APPENDIX D

Project Eligibility Criteria

1. Students who have been psychologically evaluated and found to be not eligible for participation in Dade County's Gifted Program, and who meet the following criteria, should be given first consideration for program participation.

2a. First grade students who obtained raw scores of 55 or higher on the Cooperative Preschool Inventory (CPI) administered on September 1, 1982.

b. Students in grade 1 who obtained stanine scores of 7, 8 or 9 on the Aural Comprehension and Environment sections of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT) administered in February, 1981.

c. Students in grades 3-6 who obtained stanine scores of 7, 8 or 9 on the Reading Comprehension and Mathematics Concepts sections of the Stanford Achievement Test administered in February, 1981.

d. For those few students whose Stanford Test results are not available, as specified in a-c above, the appropriate level of the 1973 edition of the Stanford Achievement Test should be administered. To be eligible for participation the student must obtain stanines 7, 8, or 9 on both subtests specified for the grade level of the student.

3. Should the application of the above criteria result in the identification of too few students, the principal will have the discretion of selecting other students with lower stanines. Students who are eligible for the Gifted Program who have not participated in said program during the current year may also be considered for participation.

4. Students who have successfully completed the program the previous school year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The School Board of Dade County, Florida adheres to a policy of nondiscrimination in educational programs/activities and employment and strives affirmatively to provide equal opportunity for all as required by:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended - prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex.

Age Discrimination Act of 1967, as amended - prohibits discrimination on the basis of age between 40 and 70.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 - prohibits discrimination against the handicapped.

Veterans are provided re-employment rights in accordance with P.L. 93-508 (Federal and Florida State Law, Chapter 77-422, which also stipulates categorical preferences for employment.